



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/668,973	0	9/24/2003	Takashi Yano	240117US-2 CONT	240117US-2 CONT 1462	
22850	7590	04/28/2005		EXAMINER		
•		MCCLELLAN	ALI, MOHAMMAD			
1940 DUKE : ALEXANDR					PAPER NUMBER	
	ŕ	•		2167		

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,973	YANO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad Ali	2167	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period who Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely.  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ja	nuary 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 2-9,11-22 and 24-31 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,10 and 23 is/are wit 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 2-9,11-22 and 24-31 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	hdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers	•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	<del>-</del>		
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Motice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	The state of the s	atent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2167

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 01/31/05.

Claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-31 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 1, 10, and 23 have been cancelled.

A terminal disclaimer have been filed for Double Patenting and Examiner withdrawn the issue.

## Response to Arguments

After further search and a thorough examination of the present application claims
 11-22 and 24-31 remain rejected.

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-31 have been considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's argue that Kamper and Evans do not teach 'displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the search result'.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Kamper teaches this limitation as, various pop-up menus are optionally displayed to the user during the search formulation and/or re-formulation to provide proactive assistance to the user. After the highlight tool has been activated a decision block and a test is made to determine whether the highlight tool has been placed over a selectable object (e.g., some text in the document being displayed). If the outcome "result" of the test is negative, the routine branches to optionally cause a pop-up "help" menu or screen to be displayed to guide the user to take some action. The menu includes such text as "please highlight text that you would like to search" or the like. If

Art Unit: 2167

the outcome "result" of the test is positive, then the routine continues. The method then optionally display an additional "help" screen if needed (e.g., after a predetermined time delay). This screen say "you have placed the highlight tool; do you want to initiate a search" or the like. A test is made to determine whether an object (e.g., a search comprising a word or words) has been selected. If the outcome "result" of the test is negative, the routine cycles back as indicated. The outcome "result" of the test is positive, the routine continues to test whether the selection is complete. If not, the routine cycles back as indicated. The outcome of the test is positive, the routine continues (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper).

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2167

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert J. Kamper ('kamper', hereinafter), US Patent 5,982,370 in view of Evans et al., ('Evans', hereinafter), US Patent 5,926,808.

With respect to claim 2,

Kamper discloses a method of managing information (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

identifying a word of an image as a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "keyword displayed image".

Art Unit: 2167

Evans discloses the claimed keyword displayed image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because keyword displayed image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Keyword displayed image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

As to claim 3,

Kamper teaches wherein the image is displayed on a display unit (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 4,

Kamper teaches wherein the information corresponding to the search result is displayed on a display unit (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 5,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of displaying additional information is performed without altering a file corresponding to the image (col. 10, lines 26-37 et seq).

Art Unit: 2167

As to claim 6,

Kamper teaches selecting, after the step of displaying information and before the step of displaying additional information, the portion of the displayed information (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 7,

Kamper teaches wherein the determining step comprises: determining the search result using a search engine accessible by a browser (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 8,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of identifying a word is performed using a pointing device (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 9,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of identifying a word is performed using a cursor position (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 11,

Kamper teaches wherein the identified word is a non-linked word (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 12,

Kamper teaches wherein, when a file is displayed on a display unit, a word from the file is identified as the keyword specified by a cursor on the display unit (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 13,

Art Unit: 2167

Kamper teaches displaying, on a display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu comprising menu items for specifying search criteria for a search engine (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper); and

specifying the menu item by a cursor, wherein the keyword and the menu items specified are input into the search engine (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 14,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying at least one search database (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 15,

Kamper teaches displaying, on a display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying output criteria of the search result (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 16,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying where to output the search result (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

With respect to claim 17,

Kamper discloses an information management device (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

a display unit configured to display an image (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper); an identification unit configured to identify a word displayed in the image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper); and

a search unit configured to input the keyword and to output a search result

Art Unit: 2167

corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper), wherein the display unit is configured to obtain the search result corresponding to the keyword from the search unit (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper), to displaying, on a display unit, a popup menu prepared based on the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65), to display information corresponding to the search result, and to display additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "word displayed in an image".

Evans discloses the claimed word displayed in an image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because word displayed in an image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Word displayed in an image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

As to claim 18,

Art Unit: 2167

Kamper teaches a selection unit configured to receive an input from a user who selects a portion of the displayed information; and at least one database for storing therein at least one file (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 19,

Kamper teaches wherein said search unit is a search engine accessible by a browser (see col. 3, lines 16-23 et seq, Kamper).

As to claim 20,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify the word using a pointing device (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 21,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify the word using a cursor position (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 22,

Kamper teaches wherein the display unit is configured to display additional information without altering a file corresponding to the image on the display unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 24,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify a non-linked word (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 25,

Kamper teaches when a file comprising a hypertext file or a non-hypertext file is displayed on the display unit, the identification unit is configured to identify a word from

Art Unit: 2167

the file as the keyword specified by the cursor (col. 10, lines 3-4) on the display unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 26,

Kamper teaches a search criteria specification unit configured to display, on the display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying search criteria for the search unit, the menu comprising menu items to be specified by a (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper); and

a transfer unit configured to transfer the keyword and the menu items specified to the search unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 27,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying at least one search database (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 28,

Kamper teaches an output criteria specification unit configured to display, on the display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying output criteria of the search result (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 29,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying where to output the result of the search (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

With respect to claim 30,

Kamper discloses an information management device (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

Art Unit: 2167

means for displaying an image (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

means for identifying a word displayed in the image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

means for determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

means for displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

means for displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

means for displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "word displayed in an image".

Evans discloses the claimed word displayed in an image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because word displayed in an image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as

Art Unit: 2167

suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Word displayed in an image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

With respect to claim 31,

Kamper discloses a computer program product storing program instructions for execution on a computer device, which when executed by the computer device, cause the computer device to perform (see Abstract, lines 4-9) the steps of:

identifying a word displayed in an image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "keyword displayed image".

Evans discloses the claimed keyword displayed image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user

Art Unit: 2167

Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the

time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references

immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1; lines 39-43,

because keyword displayed image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's

system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be

able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans,

see col. 1, lines 39-43). Keyword displayed image as taught by Evans improves to

display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a

search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 2, 17, and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Examiner suggests a technological arts like as computer should be added to the claims.

Remarks

6. US Patent 5,977,972 (Bates et al.) and US Patent 6,601,507 (Underwood et al.)

also teaches Pop-up menu including other limitations.

Application/Control Number: 10/668,973 Page 14

Art Unit: 2167

## Conclusion.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

#### Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad Ali Primary Examiner Art Unit 2167

MA April 22, 2005